



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

089
5



- 1844 -

DS 5089 .11.5



Harvard College Library

FROM

A Lawrence Lowell

The Annexation of Texas.

A

S E R M O N,

DELIVERED IN THE MASONIC TEMPLE

ON

FAST DAY.

BY JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

*Published in compliance with a Vote of the Church of
the Disciples.*

BOSTON:

OFFICE OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD.

1844.

, 11.5



Lawrence Lowell

at: books page 11

SERMON.

EZEKIEL XXXIII. 6.—*'If the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned . . . their blood will I require at the watchman's hand.'*

THIS Fast day is not to us what it was to our fathers. To them it was a reality, to us it is almost a formality. They were impelled to keep it from a present need; we retain it from regard to an honorable usage. Casting their seed into the ground, at this season of the year, when the snow recedes and the Earth opens herself before the plough, they might well ask that God should bless their labors, for the question of comfort or famine depended on the harvest which was to follow. If *our* crop fails, we get corn from Virginia, and flour from Genessee. They were surrounded by an immense and unknown wilderness, from the depths of which at any moment might emerge the cruel Indian, to murder and ravage their young settlements.

We live under our vine and fig-tree, with none to molest or make us afraid. They were led, by their weakness, to trust in God. We are tempted, by our strength, to confide in ourselves. Other causes, also, have weakened the reality of our interest in these State festivals. We have not the faith in a special Providence and a prayer-answering God which our fathers felt. Modern philosophy teaches a lesson of prudence rather than of faith. Men seem to think that though a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without God, a nation may; that though he numbers the hairs of our heads, he does not count the victims of tyranny, and will not interfere to prevent the addition of new millions of victims to those who now groan under the lash of the task-master. It is not thought inconsistent with the dignity of God to arrange the pulsations of an insect's heart, to color with gorgeous dyes the weed which is to-morrow cast into the oven; but it is supposed to be beneath his notice to care for the course of particular public events. It does not seem to be apprehended that the infinite wisdom of God may work out several problems at once, teach several lessons by each event, consult the general


good and the particular exigency by the same determination, and without a miracle, without violating any natural law, yet through and by means of natural laws, meet the special need, answer the present prayer, and avert the impending danger. This want of faith in a special Providence also causes us to take a less profound interest in these occasions, on which they brought their special needs before the throne of God. We continue, out of reverence for our fathers, a custom which they originated out of reverence for God.

But there is still another reason for our State days of Fast and Thanksgiving losing their vitality. In our fathers' days, Church and State were one. The condition of the State was therefore of deepest concern to the Church. Political events were treated of from every pulpit, and the pulpits determined in a great measure the action of the legislature. But now all this is changed. The union of Church and State has done so much harm, that we suppose we cannot separate them too widely. We suppose now that public affairs are nothing to the Christian; that the Church has nothing to do with politics; that because Christ's kingdom is

not of this world, it should be wholly indifferent to the wants of this world. If a religious man therefore takes part in politics, he often thinks it necessary wholly to secularize himself; if a clergyman feels it his duty to engage in State affairs, he is obliged, or supposes himself obliged, to cease being a clergyman.

This idea is by many persons carried to a great length. We hear now of the duty of not voting, of the necessity of being separate from all political parties and all political action. It is believed that we are in danger of being infected with disease, if we but touch with the tip of our finger, that accursed thing, the State. Many serious people are of opinion that it is a duty not to recognize in any way the authority of government; not to hold office, not to pay taxes, not to vote, not to use legal means of redress, if injured. They say: 'The State supports armies and navies, and fights battles, which we hold to be unchristian; and if we are at all connected with the State, we become partakers in its crime. The State supports slavery: we shall make ourselves responsible for that, if we have any thing to do with her.'

But to this we reply — 'If you wish to be-



come pure in this way, you must not only come out of the State, but must go out of the world. How can you walk, eat, speak, live with men, and not be partakers of wrong, reap the benefit of wrong, strengthen the hand of wrong? Who laid the pavement of the street you walk upon? The State—and you are taking advantage of it. Do you say, for example, ‘We will not wear cotton, it is grown by the unpaid labor of the slave; the free Northern air and sun which bleach it, cannot free it from the stain of our brother’s blood?’ Well then—wear woollen. But your English broadcloth is paid for by bales of cotton; there is a slight stain of human blood in that too. Wear home made cloth. It is not much better. The money you pay to the Vermonter for his wool he spends for tea-cups or knives and forks, which come from England, and are paid for by the Southern crop. We do indirectly, what we refuse to do directly. You may go and live alone in the country, and build your own house, raise your own linen, eat your own corn and potatoes; but if you so much as walk upon a public road, you are receiving the benefits of a government which encourages war and slavery.

It may, I admit, be often proper to refuse to do a thing directly, even if we are compelled to do it indirectly. But the endeavor to free ourselves from a share in the sins and evils of society by separating from it is an impossible one. The human race is so woven together, that we are compelled to bear each other's burdens, to share each other's responsibilities, and to be in contact with each other's crimes. It is because my neighbor's sins are contagious, and affect me and mine, that it becomes my right and duty to warn him of his evil, and not to suffer sin upon him. 'Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's' said Jesus — authorizing the paying of taxes to the most tremendous despotism which ever existed — to a government which supported thirty legions of soldiers. 'I write unto you' said Paul, 'not to keep company with the wicked; yet not altogether with the wicked of this world, for then must ye needs go out of the world.' This principle of an entire separation of Church and State, if carried out, would make it necessary for Christians to go out of the world.

But those who do not go so far as this, do not advocate a complete separation from the Sta-

as the duty of the Christian, do nevertheless often feel that it is not becoming in a Christian to take much interest in political movements. They think that a man is growing secular if he is interested about such matters. For a clergyman to have a decided opinion in politics, and to act decidedly, seems to them wrong. Hence clergymen are apt to be neutral. They do not have nor express strong convictions. There is to be sure a certain just foundation for this feeling. Most political questions are made merely party questions—merely between the Ins and the Outs—between the office-holders and the office-seekers. To take part in such contentions is indeed unworthy the character of any earnest man; but he may nevertheless take part in politics in a different way and with another object. He may do it to enlighten and lead the public mind to right political principles and results. If Christian men, conscientious men, independent of parties, perfectly above the suspicion of a selfish purpose, refusing all office and all privileges, would make it their business to get and give information upon public affairs, to counteract the influence of demagogues in primary assem-

blies, to make party leaders cautious how they endeavor to guide followers through unrighteous paths, it would be exactly the balance wheel which we want in our system, exactly the conservative power which would save our institutions from ruin and our freedom from degenerating into licentiousness. If we had five hundred such men in Massachusetts now, and a corresponding number in the other free States, our Union would not be endangered as it is by the prospect of the annexation of Texas. Texas could not be annexed to the Union, if there were those in whose judgment and virtue the community had confidence, who would make it their work to enlighten and awaken the public mind in the free States. The people are obliged now to get all their information from the great political parties, and neither of them will risk its hopes of an election by a strenuous effort to awaken public sentiment. They are willing that it should be expressed just so far as it can be done without drawing into a new channel the interest which they desire to keep concentrated upon the Presidential election.

It may be said that ministers ought not to take active part in public questions, because they do not understand them; that clergymen do not understand questions about banks and tariffs, and therefore are not capable of enlightening the public mind concerning them. But *might* they not understand them? Have they not as good opportunities of information as newspaper editors, who are at present almost the sole guides of public opinion. In many parts of the country, a journeyman printer, with no education, as soon as he gets able to buy a press, publishes a paper edited by himself. From that time he sets himself up, and is regarded by others, as a legitimate leader of public opinion on the gravest questions of state, and lays down the law and the fact with authority. And he *is* the leader, for the people have no other. Is it a wonder that they are deluded and cheated by demagogues, that they are led chained in troops behind the chariot wheels of office seekers? Would it not be well, if men of general education and intelligence, of piety and conscience, would make it their business to throw an infusion of justice and honor into the public thought on State

questions—to educate and inform the popular mind, and open to it sources of better information? In such a course as this I confess I see the only way in which what is sometimes called ‘the downward tendency of democracy’ can be counteracted.

What *right* has a Christian to be indifferent to public questions, to leave them to be decided by a few professed politicians? On these questions hang the happiness and misery, the progress or ruin of his country. *Peace*, with its infinite blessings,—*war*, with its endless woes, are brought about by political action. A single vote, a single opinion, may determine whether we shall have war or peace. Is not this power a talent? Ought we to bury it in the ground? Is it not our Lord’s money, and will he not call us to account for it? If every pulpit in Massachusetts should this day declare the truth concerning the question of *annexing Texas*, and if all the northern pulpits should immediately do the same, could this step be taken? And if it be taken, in consequence of a remissness in not warning the people; and if in consequence of this annexation the countless miseries and barbarities of the slave-system be prolonged a

hundred years, as they may be, who will be accountable? Let God's word answer: 'If the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned, they shall die in their iniquity, but their blood will I require at the watchman's hand.'

But the Church, it is said, has better things to attend to; the clergy are occupied with converting sinners to God. They cannot leave their own proper work and come down to these secular and political questions. Let Jesus answer this objection: '*Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.*' To God and Christ and Religion we owe, that our first and chief aim should be, to lead the souls of individuals to God. But will that excuse us from our other duties? '*These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the others undone.*' A man might as well excuse himself from paying his debts because he was subscribing to missions. The performance of one duty cannot atone for the omission of another.

It is a fatal error which we have committed, in allowing a few lawyers, office-holders and journalists to be the only guides of the public

mind upon these great moral and religious questions; these questions of humanity, progress and social happiness. The consequence is, that legislation has thus far neglected its most important duties.

With these preliminary remarks, I now proceed to the main subject of this discourse — THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS TO THE FEDERAL UNION. When I discussed this subject before you upon Thanksgiving day, last November, I was obliged to enter into a long argument to show that the discussion was necessary. Many persons at that time doubted that any attempt would be made to effect the annexation. Now, alas! it has become too evident that such is the settled and determined purpose of the South. This has indeed been long known to all who would take the trouble to look at the facts. For years it has been the darling purpose and cherished hope of Southern politicians to strengthen and uphold their favorite Institution by means of this measure. Mr. Senator Benton advocated many years ago, in the St Louis papers, what he called the *retrocession* of Texas to the United States. In the Virginia Convention in 1829, Judge Upshur, the late Secretary

of State, observed in a speech of considerable length, 'that if Texas should be obtained, which he strongly desired, it would raise the price of slaves, and be a great advantage to the slave-holders of that State.' Gov. Gilmer, of Virginia, the late Secretary of the Navy, wrote a letter January 10th, 1843, in which he declared that 'it was his opinion that Texas would be annexed, and that his opinion had not been formed without reflection, or a careful consideration of the causes which he believed were rapidly bringing about this result.' Mr. Hunter, of Virginia, made a speech a year ago, in which he declared that it was the bounden duty of the whole South to go for annexation.

The whole South *will* go for annexation. No body of men at the South are strong enough to resist the influences which will be brought to bear upon them. Some Southern whigs, I know, are opposed to it — but they will not be able to resist the tide of popular feeling which will be brought to bear upon them. They will be compelled either to join in the effort to bring about the annexation, or at any rate to be silent, and to withdraw all active opposition to it. There is *but one thing*, except the direct inter-

position of Divine Providence, which *can* vent this event from taking place; and the universal expression, by the whole Northern people, of a determination to REPEAL UNION the moment that Texas is annexed

The causes which will lead the South to insist upon the annexation, and which will induce their Representatives to vote for it, are as follow:

The first of these causes is its PECUNIARY ADVANTAGES. An immense bribe is offered to every slave-holder, in the certain rise in the value of his slaves, consequent on this measure. In an address delivered at Frankfort, Ky., it was stated that before the purchase of Louisiana, the price of slaves was about one hundred dollars, and that it had risen to four hundred dollars in consequence of that event. A speaker in the Virginia Legislature in 1832, said that the Act of Louisiana, forbidding the importation of slaves, caused their price to fall in Virginia twenty-five per cent, but added that the annexation of Texas would raise their price fifty per cent. The same opinion prevails universally in the South. Now Mr. Clay estimates the value of the slave property in the South at

twelve hundred millions of dollars. A rise of fifty per cent would be a gift to the South of six hundred millions of dollars, or an average of about three thousand dollars to every slaveholder. Is not this a prize worth struggling for?

There are many southerners who own Texan lands to a large amount, which would increase in value if Texas were admitted to the Union. This is known to be the case with many who were and are most active for the admission. The late Governor Gilmer and Judge Upshur are both said to have been large owners of Texas lands. Such also is said to be the case with Senator Walker of Mississippi, whose letter to the people of Carroll county (Ky.) has been so widely circulated.* Many others have bought Texas scrip, knowing that if the annexation takes place, the United States will assume her debt, and that it will be immediately enhanced in value. Would that these indirect bribes were all that would be offered. But so great is the importance of this measure to the inhabitants of Texas, that they will be ready to offer

* This, I observe, he has since denied.

the largest amount of lands or money to influential persons in the United States, to determine them in their favor. If one or two square miles of land can induce a wavering Senator to vote for the annexation, or to be sick at home when the vote is taken, no doubt it will be ready for him.

The second cause which will induce the South to insist on annexation, is to be found in its **POLITICAL ADVANTAGES**. Southerners are all born politicians. They have an intuitive perception of what will strengthen their position. They have always proved too strong for the North in political contests. The South has given six Presidents to the country, the North but four, including General Harrison, a Virginian by birth. The six southern Presidents have been in office forty-four years, the four Northerners only twelve. No Northerner has ever served a second term. Every Southerner, save the present incumbent, has. A majority of the Judges of the Supreme Courts, of the Speakers of the House, of the Officers in the Army and Navy, have always been from the South. The Tariff has been modified backward and forward, the National Bank has been

chartered or overthrown, according as it suited the interests or opinions of the South. Whenever it has suited the South to have duties protecting her staples, then a protecting Tariff has been constitutional and right. When she fancies that Northern manufacturers are making more out of her cotton than herself, then all protection is unconstitutional. When the object is to oppose the opinions of a few Southern States to those of the majority, they are strict constructionists of State Rights; when they wish to carry a measure which the Constitution does not authorize, they suddenly become very liberal in their interpretation of granted powers. Thus Gov. Gilmer, in his letter above referred to, speaking of the annexation, says: 'I am, you know, a strict constructionist, and do not admit the force of mere precedent to establish authority under a written constitution.' We should suppose of course, then, that he would think the annexation unconstitutional. Oh no! In a breath, he has wheeled around, and continues: 'The power conferred by the Constitution over foreign relations, and the *repeated acquisitions of territory* under it, seem to me to leave the question open as one of expediency.'

In 1827, Georgia extended her laws over Indian territories guarantied to them by treaties with the United States. To secure these guaranties for a part of their lands, the Indians had surrendered the remainder. Georgia sent her sheriffs and her constables, in defiance of the United States, to arrest Indians for disobeying laws which they had never heard of, and which were nothing to them. One of the Indians was hung, — when the law, trial and sentence were all pronounced void by the Federal courts. But all this was quietly submitted to by the General Government, and by our Northern politicians.

South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, and Florida, have all passed laws imprisoning and punishing all American or foreign seamen of African descent who may come into their ports. Yes: even Florida, bought, paid for, defended, and professedly governed, by the North, sells Northern citizens for ninety-nine years. And all this Northern politicians quietly bear.

Instances innumerable of this sort might be multiplied, to show how completely Southern politicians have become possessed of the political power of the country, and how unscrupu-

lously they exercise it. Hitherto, they have regarded themselves as quite superior to the Constitution and laws. They now begin to fear a loss of this political power in the growing strength of the North, and especially of the great North West. To balance this increasing power, they wish to add Texas to the South. Out of it may be easily made five or six slaveholding States, which will give ten or twelve Southern senators. With this addition to their strength, they may govern the North for half a century longer.

The third cause which will lead the South to insist on annexation is its **ADVANTAGES TO THE CAUSE OF SLAVERY**. The annexation of Texas will add an immense buttress to support the tottering walls of this Institution. It begins to feel the tremendous pressure bearing upon it, from the moral sentiment of the world. But the South is not yet ready to yield to this influence, and therefore it goes to the utmost extremes in its defence. It declares Slavery a good system, authorized and established by God, and it considers slaves to be the only fit foundation for the Temple of Freedom. The school of politicians, philosophers and divines

represented by Mr. Calhoun, Professor D and Rev. Theodore Clapp, maintain unblinking the doctrine that slavery is a divine institution, morally right, and politically a blessing. Mr. Wise, in an atrocious speech, made 1842, exulted in the thought that by the robbery of Mexican churches and the plundering of towns, and the overthrow of the Mexican government, Texas and the United States would be enabled to extend the blessings of slavery over the whole southern part of North America.

Let not the people of the North delude themselves with the hope that the South proposes, in *any way*, gradually or immediately, means of Colonization or of Emancipation ever to put an end to slavery. She has no such intention. There are good and wise men at the South who abhor slavery, feel its evil, and would gladly see it abolished. There are millions of Southern freemen who are slave-holders, and to whom slavery is every way a burden and a curse. But these are the rulers. It is the very curse of the system that good and wise men are compelled to throw themselves into the hands of that party which goes the greatest length in support of the

stitution. And this party, which rules the South with a rod of iron, aspires to rule the whole land. They do not intend to abolish Slavery. They intend, and declare their intention, to run its foundation deeper, to raise its black walls higher, to throw out around it new defences and outworks, to spread the shadow of its terrible banner over a wider surface. And for this end, this party is now concentrating its whole strength, and putting forth its utmost energy, to accomplish, whether the North consents to it or not, this great masterpiece of Satanic policy, the annexation of Texas.

I speak strongly—the time has come for strong speech. To use softer language now would be a sin against God and man. There are crises, in which no voice softer than thunder is suitable, no action less rapid than lightning effectual. Such is the voice and such the action which become the North now.

To the injury which the friends of annexation propose to do, in leading us without our own consent, into this new compact with slavery, they add the insult of trying to convince us that slavery will not be strengthened by it. The South seems to despise the understand-

ing no less than the spirit of the North. They even declare that this step will put an end to slavery in the United States. The argument used is that Texas is already a slave-holding country, consequently slavery is not extended by annexation over a region where it does not exist; that, in proportion as slaves increase in Texas, they will diminish in the Northern slave States, so that the locality of the slaves merely will be changed, without augmenting their number; and that finally, by the natural tendency of slavery to the South, it will pass out, through Texas, into Central America.

In reply to this argument, we would say, 'How happens it then, gentlemen, that you, the champions of slavery as a system essential to the prosperity of our republic, are also the advocates of this plan for abolishing it? You tell us, in one breath, that slavery is a good thing and ought to be extended to the Pacific Ocean; and in the next you urge annexation as the only feasible mode of putting an end to slavery! When Mr. Calhoun and Senator Walker, men whose fixed idea is the beauty of slavery, become preachers of abolition, it is *time for us to be on our guard*. A serpent

lurks in the grass. We fear these gifts to the cause of freedom, from hands which are filled with chains and whips. A sufficient proof that annexation will strengthen slavery, is found in the fact that the great advocates of the measure are the Southern ultra-slavery party. They know, better than we do, what will strengthen and what weaken their system.

But apart from this, it is not difficult to refute the sophisms of Senator Walker and his supporters. The annexation will strengthen slavery, first, by preventing its abolition in Texas. The great probability and immediate danger of this, is the very thing which has excited the South to urge this question upon us now. The probability is, that if this annexation plot fails, Texas will almost immediately abolish slavery within her limits. Her object will be to induce emigration from England and the Continent of Europe. The value of the slaves now held in Texas is nothing compared with the rise in the value of her lands which would result from opening them to free labor. The strongest pecuniary inducements will urge abolition upon her. Beside this, it will enable her to obtain a commercial treaty with England

on much better terms than she can now. Secondly, annexation will promote slavery, by adding the strength of the United States to maintain and perpetuate it in Texas, and by increasing its political power in the United States. There are occasions in war, on which the simple union of two armies, without augmenting their numbers, immensely increases their strength. Such is the case here. Thirdly, the opening of new lands, to an unlimited extent, in Texas, to the citizens of the Union, will cause a demand for slave labor, which will raise the price of slaves throughout the United States, give a new impulse to the breeding of slaves in the Union, and to the foreign slave-trade. Demand produces supply in this as in every thing else. It is certain that annexation would cause an immediate rise in the value of slaves in Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri. Would this tend to put an end to slavery in those States? Make it profitable to raise more slaves in any State, and depend upon it more will be raised.

Mr. Walker's idea of slavery's *disappearing*, through Texas, into Mexico, seems to be putting a figure of speech in the place of an ar-

gument. He gives us an image instead of a reason. If slavery were a fluid, and if Mexico was not only lower down on the map than Texas, but also physically lower, we can conceive that by letting it run into Texas it might by and by run through and 'finally disappear into the boundless regions of Mexico and Central America.' But as slavery happens to be not a fluid but an institution, we do not see how strengthening its foundations in Texas is to make it 'disappear into Mexico.'

The simple fact, stripped of all images and figures, is this. Texas is a state, now containing about one hundred thousand inhabitants spread over a surface of more than three hundred thousand square miles of territory. When it becomes as thickly settled as Ohio, it will contain about ten millions five hundred thousand inhabitants. If annexed to the United States, it will remain a slave-holding country, and perhaps half of its future population will be slaves. If not annexed, it will probably immediately become a free state, and all its inhabitants be freemen. But even if it does not at once abolish slavery within its limits, it will certainly do so in a few years, provided it be

not bound to the determined slave-system of the United States. Separate from us, it will have every inducement to emancipation. Its slaves are few in number, its soil and climate adapt it to free labor, and emigration from Germany and England will soon give a bias in favor of free labor to its policy.

Such then are the hopes and the fears which will make the South insist with its whole power, a power hitherto always successful, upon this measure. What are the evils, we must now ask, which would result from it? These, it will be seen, are not merely sufficient to show that it is inexpedient, unwise and dangerous; but that it ought not to be listened to by the North **when proposed, nor submitted to when accomplished**; that it is a wicked and a fatal measure; one which Congress has no right to attempt, which it would be sinful for the free States to allow, which would bring sure destruction upon the country; and if performed, makes a Dissolution of the Union no longer the great evil to be feared, but our last remaining hope.

The evils of annexation are these :

1. We take a step, deliberately, in the face

of the world, to strengthen and perpetuate slavery.

After having allowed slavery to lay waste the richest lands of the South, we are now preparing to send its desolations over the fertile plains of Texas. We are strengthening and hugging to our hearts anew, a system which inflicts the foulest wrongs on man—which robs him of his all, turns him into a chattel, sells bodies and souls, degrades the temple of the Holy Ghost. It is a system which destroys marriages, legalizes adultery, separates families, makes woman the victim of any unprincipled white man who can buy her, causes infinite depths of licentiousness in society, wrongs and injures masters as well as servants, poisons social happiness at its source, takes away energy for labor, makes honest industry degrading, destroys desire for high culture, and is in fine a political, social and moral evil of the first magnitude, and in the words of Mr. Clay, ‘a curse to the master and a bitter wrong to the slave.’ In re-establishing it, we are returning toward the dark ages. The whole world is abolishing slavery, and we are making ourselves a reproach and a hissing in the minds of the world

by upholding it. We add hypocrisy to our other sins, by maintaining, while we support this system, that 'we hold the truth to be self-evident that all men are born free and equal.'

With slavery where it exists, at the South, we at the North have no political relation of a kind to make us responsible for its continuance. But by forming a new union with slavery, we are becoming responsible voluntarily for all the evils which flow from it.

Mr. Walker endeavors to show, by facts taken from the Census of 1840, that the slaves at the South are happier than the free colored people at the North. These facts are certainly curious. If authentic, they would apparently prove that insanity, idiocy, deafness, dumbness and blindness are the natural consequences of freedom to the African, and that every physical power and moral faculty is shattered and overthrown by liberty. According to the census the number of free blacks subject to these maladies is one in ninety-six, of the slaves one in six hundred and seventy-two, — by which it appears that a free colored man is seven times as likely to go crazy, to lose his sight or his *hearing, as a slave.* But a more accurate ex-

amination of the details of the Census tells a different story, and shows us that if there be blindness or idiocy any where in a remarkable degree, it must lie with those who furnished, and those who confide in these statements. It appears* that this whole doctrine rests on a series of unparalleled blunders. Thus the Census declares that in Worcester, Mass. there are one hundred and thirty-three colored idiots and lunatics. These are the *white* patients in the State hospital in that town. This single blunder multiplies the colored lunatics of this State three-fold. But more than this. In a great number of instances, the Census gives a larger number of colored insane in a town, than ~~of~~ colored people of all sorts. In many places where it states in one column that there are no colored people at all, it goes on in the next to declare that there are from one to five insane colored people. In other places the sum total of colored people is two or three, and five or six of these are unhappily insane. Deleterious as the influences of liberty may be,

* See article in the *American Journal of the Medical Sciences*. Philadelphia: January, 1844. By EDWARD JARVIS, M. D., Dorchester, Mass.

it is difficult to believe that it can create insanity when there is nobody to operate upon.

Thus falls to the ground the whole of **Mr. Walker's** argument on the evils of Freedom.

2. The annexation of Texas is a violation of the Constitution of the most glaring character.

We have given no power, by our Constitution, to our Executive or Legislature to introduce us into any such compact. It is a daring usurpation of authority which has never been delegated. The Legislatures of Ohio, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and other States, have repeatedly declared that they cannot be bound by any such compact, and that any such league, covenant or arrangement would be unconstitutional.

To show that the Executive may annex Texas by means of the treaty-making power, great stress is laid on the purchase of Louisiana and of Florida. But the distinction is clear between the purchase of territory and the annexation of an Independent State. After territory has been bought we may do what we choose with it, we may sell it again if we do not wish to retain it, we bind ourselves to noth-



ing in buying it. But in annexing Texas, the Executive is making a contract for us with another power, in which we are not consulted at all. A contract, when made, cannot be broken but by the consent of both parties. Certainly then, it cannot be entered into but by the consent of both parties.

That the purchases of Louisiana and Florida are no precedents for this measure, was admitted by Secretary Forsyth, himself a Southerner, in his letter to Memucan Hunt, Texan Ambassador. He says: 'The question of the annexation of a foreign independent State has never before been presented to this government. Since the adoption of the Constitution, two large additions have been made to the domain of the United States. In acquiring these, the Government was not actuated by a mere thirst for sway over a broader space. Paramount interests of many members of this confederacy, and the permanent well-being of all, imperatively urged upon this government the necessity of an extension of its jurisdiction over Florida and Louisiana.'

In 1838 an admirable Report against the annexation of Texas was presented to the Legis-

lature of this State, by the late lamented champion of liberty, James C. Alvord. In this he conclusively showed that the Federal Government has no right to admit a foreign nation into the Union, especially if, as the Southern theory declares, it be a compact of Independent States. It is as true of an association of States as of individuals, that no new members can be admitted into the partnership without the consent of *all* and *each* of the previous partners. Civil law carries this principle so far that not even an express agreement of the parties at the time of forming the association, nor any *general* agreement, is sufficient to justify the admission of a new partner, a *special* consent being necessary in each particular case.

And finally, to show that the purchase of Louisiana is no precedent, we have the express declaration of Mr. Jefferson himself, who effected the purchase, that the act was unconstitutional, and only to be justified by necessity, the splendor of the acquisition, and the silent consent of the people.

The advocates of annexation endeavor to give a color of constitutionality to the measure, by contending that this is recovering territory

which formerly belonged to us, and which our government had no right to relinquish. But even granting, that by the treaty of 1803, our boundaries were extended to the Rio Norte, which is very doubtful, they were fixed, solemnly, by the treaty of 1819, at the Sabine. If we acquired the territory by one treaty, we relinquished it by another. If we had no right to relinquish it, then we had no right to acquire it. If we have a right to violate the Treaty of 1819, and bring up again our former claim, then relinquished, why may we not violate any other treaty we have ever made, and stand before the world, as a power whose pledged word is not binding, which keeps no faith, and with which no contract can be made?

There are other arguments, as weighty as those now urged against this measure. It is a robbery of Mexico, a piece of gross injustice toward a nation with whom we are at peace. It would involve us immediately in a war with Mexico, and ultimately in a war with England. It is a dangerous extension of the territory of our country, already large enough. It would bring about a dissolution of the Union. And finally, it is a measure for which no one

good reason can be urged. It is wholly unnecessary. What are the reasons adduced in its favor? It is said that if we do not take possession of it, England will. This is the bugbear which is held up to drive us headlong into this measure. Are we then to be driven, by fear of what England may do, into a measure which is so dangerous, and of such doubtful policy? Is this the attitude of an independent nation, this cowardly fear of England? There is no reason to believe that she means to meddle with Texas. She has formally disavowed it. But if she did, are we not able to protect ourselves now, as well as we were fifty years ago?

What other reasons are given for this measure? One is that our present Western boundary is a crooked and ugly looking line. 'It is a succession of steps and curves,' says Mr. Walker, 'carving out the great valley of the West into a shape that is absolutely hideous.' Certainly a beautiful outline is desirable, but hardly worth risking a dissolution of the Union to obtain. Another reason is that it brings a foreign power in close proximity to our Western and Southern borders. But wherever we

stop, except we take possession of the whole continent, we shall probably have a foreign power near us. 'There are very good harbors in Texas, and none in the United States west of the Mississippi.' Good harbors are desirable, but ought we to rob our neighbors to obtain them? 'Texas is extremely valuable, has live oak,' etc. Very true; but is it worth while to re-establish slavery, to assume the ten million Texan debt, and risk wars with the whole world in defence of slavery, in order to get some live oak, when Florida is already full of it? 'It would be of great commercial advantage, and encourage our manufacturing interests.' Perish both, rather than seek to foster them by such an act of iniquity as this?

'What must be, must be,' says the Democratic Review for April, and advocates annexation because it is inevitable. One of the main reasons given for this belief, more worthy of a Turk than a Christian, is, that Texas looks on the map as if it ought to belong to us, and that it seems to be geographically a part of the territory of the Union. Such reasons as these do not deserve to be answered.

What then — for we must hasten to a con-

clusion—WHAT OUGHT THE NORTH TO DO TO PREVENT THIS MEASURE? As we have already intimated, there is but one way by which it can be prevented, and that is by a universal expression through the North of determined opposition. Even supposing that a majority cannot immediately be found in Congress in its favor, it is certain that this majority *will* be obtained except opposition to it be made a Northern question. No Southern senators or statesmen can oppose long the influences which will be used to make them accede to it. They must either determine to support the measure, or give their places to those who will. In the North is our only hope, and yet vain and empty seems that reliance. Two Northern legislatures have refused by a considerable majority, to instruct their senators to oppose the measure. Ten or more Northern senators are said to be now ready to go in favor of it. Our Northern politicians are ready, many of them, for the sake of Southern votes, to support the South in this nefarious project. Others, who profess to be opposed to it, say ‘peace, peace,’ and think it not necessary to take any step in opposition to it. They say for example that

Massachusetts has expressed her opinion already, and nothing more need be done. Suppose you saw a man about to kill your child — would you be satisfied with expressing your opinion once in opposition to it? Such watchmen as these, who when they should blow the trumpet, and give the people warning, say instead that they have already blown a single blast, and that is enough, — what do such watchmen deserve? ‘Massachusetts *has* expressed her opinion —’ What of that? Does the South wish to know her opinion? She knew it before. What is needed — the only thing which can do any good, is an expression, not of *opinion*, but of *determination* by the freemen of the North, the *determination* that this act shall never take place with their consent, and if it does take place without it, it shall never be submitted to. The South ought to see and feel that we are in *earnest* about it this time. We were opposed to the purchase of Louisiana. We submitted to that. We were opposed to the Missouri compromise, and we submitted to that. We were opposed to the admission of Arkansas, and we submitted to that. The South says ‘the North will submit

to any thing and every thing.' She ought to see that there is a point beyond which she must not go. If we allow Texas to be annexed to these States, we are founding slavery again, we are extending its black and accursed shadow over an immense and beautiful region from which it has been once expelled, we are establishing the supremacy of slavery over freedom in our national counsels, we are making ourselves before the world the pillars of this dark system of infamy and wrong, we are robbing an ally with whom we are at peace, we are making wars inevitable, we are undoing the work of our fathers, we are faithless to their noble efforts and generous sacrifices, their blood will cry from the ground against us as recreants and traitors to every principle for which they labored.

'But 'Massachusetts has expressed her opinion.' Nothing more is necessary. She has informed the South that, on the whole, she does not think it will be right to annex Texas. What does the South care for such an expression as this? She throws it under the table in our national halls, she spurns it under her foot. That is not the way for old Massachusetts to

express her opinion. Wherever men can come together in town-meeting and primary assembly, in lyceum hall or the church of God, they should publicly declare, man by man, their determination never to be partners in this compact of sin. Yes, in the house of God, worshipping him who is the Lord of Truth and Justice, let us lift our hands and say, 'We cannot do this great wickedness and sin against God.' Shall we, can we sit silent, and say, 'We have a majority of four or five senators against it;' or, 'We passed some resolutions against it in our last legislature'? Oh no! Not so should the Land of the Pilgrims lift her voice; not such the echo that should ring from the old Plymouth Rock; not such the tone of Fanueil Hall. Oh no! Let me use the noble words of one of our New-England poets,— words often quoted, but never more applicable than now :

Oh no! Methinks from all her wild green mountains,
 From valleys where her slumbering fathers lie,
 From her blue rivers and her crystal fountains,
 And clear, cold sky;
 From her rough coasts and isles, which hungry Ocean
 Gnaws with his surges; from the fisher's skiff

swaying with the breeze's motion
 round rock and cliff ;
 fireside of her unbought farmer,
 the laborer, at his loom and wheel,
 in smith-shop, where beneath the hammer
 Rings the red steel ;
 and all, if God has not forsaken
 and left us to an evil choice,
 summer thunderbolt shall waken
 A PEOPLE'S VOICE !

A League might be formed, of true-
 men of all parties, to oppose this one.
 They should pledge themselves not
 for any man to any public office who
 is openly opposed to Annexation.

These words are all idle, perhaps, and ineffectual.
 I fling them to the winds. I have de-
 manded my own soul. I would not be a faithless
 man in this hour of darkness and peril.
 As dark as the prospect is, let us still trust
 in God. Let us do our own duty manfully,
 and go to him for succor. He is our defence
 and our shield. He is our strong tower and
 our fortress. He will not forsake the nation
 that cleaves to him.



3 2044 004 476 107

**THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED
AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS
NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON
OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED
BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE
NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE
BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.**

**Harvard College Widener Library
Cambridge, MA 02138 (617) 495-2413**

